DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 397 079 TM 025 079

AUTHOR McNeely, Sharon
TITLE Title VII Special Alternative Grant BRIDGES: Collaborative Teaching in Bilingual and ESL Project Evaluation 1994-1995.
INSTITUTION Cicero Board of Education, IL.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE [96]
CONTRACT T003A40072
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Bilingual Education; Cooperation; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; Elementary School Teachers; *English (Second Language); Federal Aid; Grants; *Literacy; Mathematics; Parent Participation; *Professional Development; Program Evaluation; Sciences; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Cicero School District 99 IL; *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII

ABSTRACT

This document presents evaluation results for Cicero Public School District 99 for the Illinois Title VII Special Alternative Program Grant for the 1994-1995 school year. This was the first year of funding of the special alternative grant and the BRIDGES program, which provided collaborative teams of bilingual and English-as-a-second-language (ESL) teachers to develop means to support each other and their students and the parents of their students through training, collaboration, and development of materials and resources. One of the main purposes of the program was to develop the student's literacy skills in English, mathematics, and science. The evaluation demonstrated that the project was successful in meeting its major goal of developing collaborative teams of bilingual and ESL teachers. The timing of the grant and report deadlines did not allow for collection of data to indicate that literacy skills, science skills, and mathematics skills increased among students whose teachers engaged in the collaboration, but ongoing evaluation will address these concerns. Data collected so far indicate that teachers were using new strategies, developing new materials, and receiving training. Data also established that parents received training and resources. BRIDGES worked with 40 elementary school teachers in 9 schools, each of whom had about 30 students. Recommendations for program improvement are made on the assumption that the school district will apply for future funding and will attempt to document student outcomes. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
SHARON McNEELY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 397 079

CICERO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DISTRICT #99

TITLE VII SPECIAL ALTERNATIVE GRANT
BRIDGES:
COLLABORATIVE TEACHING
IN BILINGUAL AND ESL
PROJECT EVALUATION
1994-1995

GRANT NUMBER
T003A40072

SHARON McNEELY, Ph.D.
EVALUATOR
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
(312) 794-2788

TM025079

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This document was created by Sharon McNeely, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, Illinois 60625, as an independent contractor with the Cicero Public Schools. In this capacity, Dr. McNeely served as the external evaluator for the Title VII Special Alternative Grant BRIDGES: Collaborative Teaching in Bilingual and ESL, Year I. The report, the formats, and the visuals are the responsibility of the evaluator.

The report could not have been completed without the continued support and input from Cindy Mosca, Title VII Project Director for the Cicero Public Schools. Ms. Mosca was responsible for providing historical information and statistical data related to the background and project development parts of this report. She is not responsible for data developed by the author related to the actual evaluation's methodology and analysis.

Any subsequent modification or use of the report and its data will be allowed only by written permission of both Cicero Public Schools Title VII Project Director, Cindy Mosca, and the report author, Sharon McNeely.

The evaluator expresses her appreciation to the teachers, staff, parents, and students involved in this grant. They have all willingly given of much time and energy to cooperate with the evaluation process. Without them, this evaluation report would not be possible.

Executive Summary

This document presents the evaluation results for Cicero Public School District #99 of Illinois Title VII Special Alternative Program Grant for the 1994-1995 school year. This is the first year of funding and implementation of the special alternative grant which provides collaborative teams of bilingual and ESL teachers to develop means to support each other and their students and the parents of their students through their training, collaboration, and development of materials and resources. In the course of this evaluation, teachers responded to surveys, on-site visits were conducted by the external evaluator and additional data, both quantitative and qualitative, were collected and analyzed.

One of the purposes of this Project was to increase literacy development for students who have achieved some oral proficiency in English, and therefore are designated Limited English Proficient (LEP). The collaboration of the bilingual and ESL teachers had as one of its purposes the development of the student's literacy skills in the areas of English, math and science. As a part of the overall design, there was also an intent to increase the professional development opportunities and instructional repertoires of billingual teachers of limited English proficient students. There also was a goal to involve parents in the education of their children, and provide some literacy training and develop some materials for parents to use to interact with their children.

This evaluation demonstrates that the project was successful in meeting its major goal of developing collaborative teams of bilingual and ESL teachers, or providing training, and of providing materials for the teachers and the parents. The timing of the grant and the deadlines for the report did not allow for collection of data to indicate that literacy skills, science skills, and math skills increased among the students who teachers engaged in collaboration. However, data to

address this concern will be collected. There was data collected to support the objectives that training was provided, and to support the objectives related to material development. These data indicated that teachers were using new strategies, developing new materials, and receiving training for areas of which they were unfamiliar. These data also indicate that parents received training and materials and resources that they previously had not had available to them.

This executive summary includes a review of activities undertaken as part of this grant, a review of the implementation of the project, and a review of the evaluation methodology. The major findings of the evaluator are presented. In addition, conclusions are drawn and recommendations are made.

The BRIDGES collaboration project worked with a total of forty teachers, each of whom had about 30 students in his/her classroom. These teachers were spread across nine schools in the District. The teachers taught in the elementary levels. Over 95% of the bilingual and ESL students of these teachers were of Hispanic ethnicity. The project provided opportunities for bilingual teachers to collaborate with ESL teachers to develop team teaching materials for use in the bilingual classroom, and to develop English and math and science literacy through the use of innovative teaching techniques, and the collaborative models. The project also coincided with the general goals of Title VII and the national education goals.

The funds provided under this project were limited, and did not begin to cover the many expenses which were part of the project. It is commendable that the Cicero Public Schools remained committed to not only meeting the project's specific objectives, but also to meeting its bigger, general goals. To that end, teachers and parents have received ongoing training and support from the District. Part of this training has involved application of the Teaching Integrated Math and

Science (TIMS) program in the classroom, cooperative learning, effective lesson planning, human relations, and conflict management. In addition, many teachers have taken advantage of the District's professional development reimbursement plan which provides partial reimbursement for teachers who attend external professional development activities, such as graduate classes, continuing education workshops, etc. This reimbursement policy has also helped the district in that several teachers have been able to use this to complete ESL or bilingual certification programs.

The training provided directly through the district, and through the reimbursement policy of the district has benefitted the project by providing an incentive for teachers to stay in the District and become certified in bilingual and in ESL. The teachers also could use the training to help them prepare a resource book for use by teachers in the District, and for the parents to use to develop math and science literacy at home. These booklets are available for all teachers in the district to use as they prepare lessons. The parent booklet is available for parents to use at home with their children. While the materials were designed to intergrate math and science literacy, they also met the needs of a number of parents in providing them with further training in their own use of basic skills. A further indirect outcome was the number of parents who were involved with their children increasing at the schools which had teachers participating in this program.

The LAS is only given once a year, and therefore could not be used in the way it was originally written in the grant proposal. Rather, performance-based assessments had to be used to determine if the students showed a gain in their English proficienty and in their working knowledge of math and science.

This is the first year of the grant. As there were problems in lag time of notification of receiving the grant, and difficulties in obtaining the materials teachers requested to engage in some of their

team teaching activities, the evaluator often had to rely on the teacher's reports as to what happened (see Attachment #1). Additionally, as LAS testing only occurs once a year, the primary indicator of student working knowledge was an examination of work placed into portfolios by the students or the teachers.

The recommendations made herein are made based on the assumption that the District will be applying for future funding for a program continuation, and for developing similar programs. The recommendations are:

1) Teachers need to have students keep good performance-assessment records, and portfolios that are reflective not only of the current skills the student has learned, but also the skills which preceded the mastery. The teachers need to be responsible for collecting data related to their students' achievements in the English proficiency and the math/science areas; and for forwarding this data to the evaluator.

2) Future programs need to continue to find staff who are willing to be part of the program and who are willing to put the time and effort into developing materials collaboratively.

3) The training aspect of the program needs to continue, but with some minor modifications to add to accountability and the grant evaluation process.

4) The high level of parent involvement needs to continue.

5) The district needs to continue to find alternative ways to show support for their teachers.

These recommendations are based on the findings, and lack of availability of some assessment data.

1) Teachers need to have students keep good performance-assessment records, and portfolios that are reflective not only of the current skills the student has learned, but also the skills which preceded the mastery. The teachers need to be responsible for collecting data related to their

students' achievements in the English proficiency and the math/science areas; and for forwarding this data to the evaluator.

The District does not have a system for maintaining student information in a central location. Records and other information is kept at the local school. The test data is kept at the local school. Unless the teacher assumes responsibility for developing and keeping data that is relevant to supporting student achievement, the evaluator will have to go from school to school to try to obtain this information. That is haphazard and does allow for more errors.

2) Future programs need to continue to find staff who are willing to be part of the program and who are willing to put the time and effort into developing materials collaboratively.

The teachers involved in year one reported that they were willing to be part of the program. They reported that they enjoyed the monthly meetings, working with others, and feeling that they had somewhere to turn with their questions. The materials that they developed took a great deal of time and effort, and an unwilling staff member would quickly find him/herself unable to keep up with the needs of the students.

3) The training aspect of the program needs to continue, but with some minor modifications to add to accountability and the grant evaluation process.

One of the areas of concern for anyone who is training is to ask what is cognitively learned, and what is behaviorally learned. That is, why do we do waht we do? The training that is provided for the staff is excellent. There are several options, and opportunities for training. The only glitch is that all of the training is self-reported, and it has yet to be determined if teachers actually changed instructional strategies based on an inservice workshop.

4) The high level of parent involvement needs to continue.

Without parent involvement, the schools would not be able to function. For this particular grant, the parents who were involved attended family math workshops, may have run these workshops,

worked as paid math/science facilitators, or worked to train other parents. This involvement is bound to have an effect on the schools.

5) The district needs to continue to find alternative ways to show support for their teachers. The district needs to work with the Program Director to ascertain the needs for various kinds of inservice training, and to find ways to honor the work of the teachers. The collaboration is a good start, but does not go far enough in providing ways for teachers to be commended without pushing them into administration. One way that support could be shown is to provide more aides in the classroom. Aide work could be done by family members, by pre-service teachers, or by parents. The evaluator is not advocating one way as better than the other, rather that the district do what it can to build various avenues of support for teachers.

This final evaluation report includes information about the design and implementation of this Title VII project, and is divided into seven sections which include:

1. Historical Overview
2. Program Description
3. Evaluation Methodology/Data Analysis for Year one
4. Results for Year One
5. Conclusions and Recommendations
6. Appendices

Historical Overview

Since 1976, Illinois has had mandated bilingual education for limited English proficient children. Schools which enroll 20 or more children of one language background have been mandated to provide appropriate services in a transitional bilingual education program. In 1985, as part of the School Reform Act, the statute required that all children of limited English proficiency be provided special educational services to meet their linguistic needs. As a result of this mandate, demographic shifts in the population, and new methods of determining bilingual program eligibility, the number of students eligible to receive these services has grown enormously.

The Cicero Public Schools are located in Cook County, Illinois. This district, District #99, is an urban-like suburb of Chicago. The students face the problems of gangs, drugs, and violence. They also face the issues of ethnic migration and centration which has resulted in enclaves of various ethnics groups developing. In Cicero, these enclaves allow students to have the richness of their native cultures, but also minimize the need to learn and use English. The District attempts to deal with these concerns by providing bilingual education services, and services which are designed to make students feel safer. Not all of the students from minority backgrounds require bilingual services. Many start in the bilingual program and transition out. Others do not require the services. The District reports that the minority rate for Hispanic students was 73% in 1994. The rate has been growing since then. Other minority groups bring the total minority rate to an estimated 80% of the District students.

District #99's bilingual program has grown each year it has been in existence. The program currently serves an estimated 3,100 students who are of limited English proficiency. The growth in this program has varied yearly, but has always been growth. This number currently represents about 33% of the total student population, up from 25% the year before. The current student

population consists of students from at least 20 major language groups. The varies of programs and services provided is also growing, with over 100 teachers and other employees now serving the LEP students in the district. The 1994-95 District data showed 70 bilingual techers, 20 ESL teachers, 16 program assistants, and 14 native language tutors. The services this group generally performs is full day self-contained or half day pull-out for full-time bilingual students, pull out for part-time students consisting of ESL with native language tutoring, or pulll out ESL only program for non-Hispanic students.

District #99 has been pressed to serve the LEP students. It is a unique district. It serves only .45% of the total school population in the state, but almost 4% of the state's total LEP population. The bilingual program is now the second largest in the state. This is compounded by the fact that almost 63% of the students in the district are categorized as from low-income families.This is compared to the state figure of 30.3%.

As the district sought to deal with its growth in LEP students, a Title VII project director was hired, and a comprehensive plan was developed to deal with the growth. Part of the growth also meant that the district had to undertake a comprehensive training program for its staff. The Title VII project director sought to find ways for teachers to work with LEP students and also have the professional development training needed. As Title VII Project Director, Ms. Cindy Mosca, has sought to support the teachers by providing inservice workshops, graduate coursework, in-class consultation, and phone consultation. Separate evaluation of the Title VII project has shown that the project is meeting its goals.

One of the concerns in trying to provide a comprehensive training program for the staff is that in the state of Illinois it is difficult to find fully certified bilingual teachers. Additionally, as District

#99's salary is lower than that of neighboring suburbs and of the city schools, the District has been hard-pressed to find and keep qualified staff. Of the seventy teachers who are providing bilingual services, only nine are fully certified by the state. Seventeen teachers have teaching certificates and are working on the required coursework for a bilingual endorsement. The rest have provisional certificates which represent a range of years of education and years of experience in the classroom. The Title VII Project Director determined that the teachers serving bilingual students needed a range of supportive and instructional services.

As an outgrowth of the Title VII Project, this Special Alternative Program Grant (SAPG) was developed. This grant sought to specifically meet some of the overall Title VII project objectives through a program called BRIDGES. The program was designed to serve 900 students in grades kindergarten through eighth grade, and provide support for bilingual teachers who need it from fully certified teachers who have additional hours in ESL and possess state endorsements.

The district did not have the financial resources to meet its goals for this aspect of the project on its own. Through grant application, it sought funds from the United States Department of Education to assist in the implementation of the BRIDGES program.

The focus of this grant was to meet objectives in three areas, instruction, materials development, and training. This is the first year of the grant.

Program Description

The BRIDGES project was developed to create collaborative teams of bilingual and ESL teachers that would provide the best possible service to the growing non-native English language population and would reach out to parents and other ESL classes. Ms. Cindy Mosca, is the year-round Title VII Director for District #99. She also served as the Program Director for the BRIDGES program grant. Her role was to coordinate staff development including arranging for outside consultants, conducting workshops for teachers, providing demonstrations for teams; serving as a resource person to program teachers; serving as liaison between the various training groups and the district; and attending Title VII conferences and reporting back to Title VII staff. This meant that her job included conducting the needs assessment, determining which needs would be best met, organizing and coordinating training, coordinating the liaisons between teachers working on the grant, assisting teachers in preparing their daily lesson plans, visiting classrooms to provide feedback to the teachers, and working with the evaluator to coordinate completion of year one and the start of year two of the grant. Additionally, the Program Director took on the role of working with parents who were part of this grant, and often facilitating parent and student involvement in activities covered under this grant.

In all the Program Director spent time working with each teacher on both a one-to-one consultation basis and in small groups. The Program Director also worked with the large group of teachers, having once a month meetings to go over innovative teaching ideas, provide inservice training, and allow teachers to share their work with the entire group. The small and large group training included inservices, a graduate level course, and other course work. The training emphasized the development of innovative instructional skills, team-building, learning styles, and communication.

The program was designed so that the teachers who were involved in the program had their classes used as part of the program. Therefore, their students directly benefitted from the program. The parents of these students also benefitted, because they had the opportunity to be involved in the parent classes which included English and family math.

The program was designed so that Title VII funds were used to subside ESL teachers' salaries, pay for after school planning time, provide for training for teachers and parents, and pay for materials development. The "Bridges" that were created were to provide needed support for the bilingual teachers in their classrooms, thus giving support indirectly to their students. Schedules were developed so that each bilingual teacher's class received the services of an ESL teacher for 30-45 minutes per day. Together, the ESL and the bilingual teacher planned a lesson relevant to the bilingual class instruction, determined their roles, and provided the instruction to the students. The district has a commitment to teach using a program called TIMS (Teaching Integrated Math and Science), sheltered instruction, direct instruction, and cooperative learning. The lessons that were planned were to use these kind of instructional methods while trying to develop English language proficiency by having the lesson be an extension of and directly related to concepts being taught by the bilingual teacher in the core subjects of math and science. The Bridges that were to be created were between ESL and bilingual teachers, between teachers and students, between teachers and parents, and between parents and students.

There were six program objectives written into the grant. The two instructional objectives were: 1) English: Students will demonstrate a pre/post gain of at least 25% in English proficiency as determined by the Language Assessment Scales (LAS) and the criteria established by Pierce and O'Malley in *Performance and Portfolio Assessment for Language Minority Students* (herein called Objective #1).

2) Math/Science: Using portfolio and performance-based assessment, students will demonstrate a working knowledge of math/science concepts selected from the bilingual curriculum and intergrated into the ESL program (herein called Objective #2).

These instructional objectives were long-term objectives, and were not readily assessable. The LAS is given yearly by the District. The District is starting the use of portfolio assessment, but has not used them long enough to have established criteria for some items to be placed in the portfolio, and has not dealt with concerns for fairness, reliability, and validity. The Project Director sought to deal with these concerns by inservicing the staff on alternative assessment practices, and providing other trainings related to instructional processes. The Director worked with teachers to determine their strengths, learning styles, and communication strategies. Team-building sessions were developed, and in addition to training on lesson planning the Director met with teachers to design lessons. This was followed by insuring that teachers received TIMS training, and had the opportunity to participate in graduate level courses through a local university. The Director served as a resource person, and tried to monitor that the pairings of an ESL teacher with a bilingual teacher involved one of three collaborate models. The Director conducted clinical observations of classroom performance, and helped teachers understand how particular classroom behaviors might be directly tied to assessment results.

Another part of the grant included two materials development objectives. They were:

1) BRIDGES staff will prepare a resource book containing guidelines, strategies and sample activities for implementing team teaching of ESL in the bilingual classroom (herein called Objective #3).

2) BRIDGES staff, through the Parent ESL classes, will prepare a resource book for parents and their children with strategies and activities to be used within the family to develop language through math and science (herein called Objective #4).

Teachers who were unfamiliar with specific aspects of materials development were trained in how to prepare a resource book, and how to implement team teaching. The process of developing the resource book happened throughout the year, as various resources and samples became available to the teachers, were piloted, and then were infused into the curriculum. The booklets that were developed were organized by the teachers and made available for other teachers to use in their lesson planning. Part of this development necessitated the sharing and teaming of the ESL and the bilingual teachers. It also meant that teachers get together and share ideas for the development of their resource areas both for teachers and for parents. The development of the Parent ESL booklet also required that teachers collaborate with each other and with parents as they developed materials which parents could and would use with their students/children at home.

There were two training objectives for the grant. They were:

1) BRIDGES teaching staff will demonstrate successful implementation of one of the following collaborative models: 1) Partners Through Participation; 2) Partners through Instructional Support; 3) Partners Through Team Teaching (herein called Objective #5).

2) BRIDGES ESL parent participants will demonstrate increased involvement in the education of their children in one of the following ways: joining the PTA, volunteering in their child's classroom, joining the Parent Advisory Council, developing parent support groups (herein called Objective #6).

One of the components related to training the staff meant that the staff have the opportunity to not only learn about the various collaborative models, but also have the chance to use them. The

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Director provided information about the models to the teachers. This information was supplemented by having the teachers try the different models and indicate which choices they were making for progressing in the collaboration process.

The way that the grant was set-up meant that there was little direct control over what any parents did or how they were linked to the grant. The Director trained teachers to try to get students to involve their parents in the schooling processes. They also recognized that it might take some time before there was a connection between attending a parent training session and becoming involved in the schooling processes.

Evaluation Methodology/Data Analysis of Year One

The evaluation of the Cicero Title VII Special Alternative Program Grant (SAPG) has been designed to assess the extent to which the pre-established objectives of the year one project were met, as well as to provide qualitative information on how the grant is progressing. The long-term goal is to provide longitudinal data that considers the achievement of students of teachers involved with the grant and compare it with the achievement of students whose teachers were not involved with the grant, but also taught bilingual classes.

The external evaluation included structured interviews, observations, anecdotal reports, surveys, review of videotapes, review of journals, and analysis of primary and secondary data. This qualitative and quantitative data was used to determine the degree to which the program successfully met its proposed objectives. The results section in this report includes information on data related to the objectives and the other analysis.

This evaluator has served the district by previously evaluating other developmental grants. The evaluator was able to attend a variety of the training sessions, observe classrooms, conduct interviews, and otherwise collect data over an extended period of time. A great deal of data was collected as a result of this evaluation process. Other data has not yet been collected, and will be over the course of this next year. The data reported to date are a small part of the overall data collected for this evaluation.

The various objectives of the program required various methods for assessment. In an effort to efficiently discuss these objectives as they related to the evaluation methodology, the order of the objectives as they were renumbered, will be followed.

Objectives #1 and #2 were related to the student achievement as a result of being in this program. The English objective was that students will demonstrate a pre-/post- gain of at least 25% in English proficiency as determined by the LAS and the criteria established by Pierce and O'Malley in *Performance and Portfolio Assessment for Language Minority Students.* The math/science objective was that using portfolio and performance-based assessment, students will demonstrate a working knowledge of math and science concepts selected from the bilingual curriculum and integrated into the ESL program. In reality, neither Objective could be assessed over the 1994-1995 school year. The District has no central data base on its students. Data is kept locally at each school building. There were nine school buildings which had teachers involved in this project. By the time the grant started, students had already had their LAS testing completed, and neither their teachers, or the Project Director, or the evaluator, had easy access to that information. The LAS is only given once a year in the District, or its reliability and validity are jeopardized. The teachers typically do not have access to that information, as it is put in the student's file, which is kept in the school office. Lacking a central computerized system to track the students, there was no way to try to obtain the initial data except to go school by school and try to collect it by going through the student files. Having this data was of no help for this report, as the LAS for 1995-96 has not yet been given and entered into the student's files at the time the report was due. Therefore, it was determined that the teachers and the evaluator would work together during year two to obtain the longitudinal data of the year one students, and start adding the data of any new grant year two students. This data will include the student's LAS scores, and selected portfolio assessment data.

The portfolio assessment system is new to the district, and is not completely implemented in all of the classrooms. The year one teachers participating in the grant had extensive training over the 1994-95 school year in using the portfolios, how to establish fair, reliable, and valid assessments, and how to develop the information needed to have these assessments yield qualitative and

quantitative data. The teachers began the process of putting these portfolios into place during the 1994-95 school year, but did not have early year assessments which could act as pre-assessments for the purposes of this grant. Therefore, it was determined that the actual assessing of Objectives #1 and #2 could not be completed until the following year.

Objective #3 stated that BRIDGES staff will prepare a resource book containing guidelines, strategies and sample activities for implementing team teaching of ESL in the bilingual classroom. The assessment process involved looking at the actual materials that were developed, and determining the number and kinds of strategies and activities provided. Additionally, teacher interviews were conducted to find out about the nature of their contributions to the book and their use of it. Results of the post-program teacher surveys (see Attachments #1 and #2) were also used for this assessment. Both quantitative and qualitative data resulted from this analysis.

Objective #4 stated that BRIDGES staff, through the Parent ESL classes, will prepare a resource book for parents and their children with strategies and activities to be used within the family to develop language through math and science. The assessment process involved looking at the actual materials developed, and discussing with parents if and how the book was used within the family. This yielded primarily qualitative data.

The grant's Objective #5 was that BRIDGES teaching staff will demonstrate successful implementation of one of the following collaborative models: 1) Partners Through Participation; 2) Partners Through Instructional Support; 3) Partners Through Team Teaching. The assessment process for this involved obtaining data from the teachers surveys (Attachments #1 and #2), interviewing some teachers, observing in some classrooms, and interviewing the Director, who conducted a clinical observation with each of the teachers involved in the program.

The final Objective (#6) was that BRIDGES ESL parent participants will demonstrate increased involvement in the education of their children in one of the following ways: joining the PTA, volunteering in their child's classroom, joining the Parent Advisory Council, developing parent support groups. The assessment involved interviews with some parents, an interview with the Director, and looking at the information obtained from teacher surveys (Attachments #1 and #2). None of the schools involved in the program had kept records reflecting the involvement or non-involvement of parents, based on the classroom assigned to their children. As a result, it was not possible to obtain information directly from the schools concerning the extent to which parts of this objective were met.

For this report, the evaluation process began shortly after the grant began to function, and continued through the end of the grant. Many of the Year One Objectives will be evaluated throughout year two as more processes are put in place to further implement the grant and the collection of evaluative information. The results that were obtained are reported in the results section.

Results of Year One

The results will be presented as they relate to each Title VII SAPG Objective. Further information deemed appropriate to the program will be presented after the specific objectives' results are presented.

As stated in the methodology section, Objectives #1 and #2 of the grant could not be assessed at this time. The data for assessing those items is still being collected, and will be reported with the Year Two grant evaluation report. At that time, both LAS scores and student portfolios will be available to the evaluator for assessment. Additionally, it is anticipated that the District will have some of the information needed to follow the students placed into a central data base.

The BRIDGES staff did prepare a resource book that contained guidelines, strategies, and sample activities for implementing team teaching of ESL in the bilingual classroom. There were forty teachers involved in the program from start to finish. There were approximately fifteen different suggested strategies, with some overlap for some of them. There were ten different sample activities that were compiled that each involved collaboration. Observations, interviews, and survey data found that many more activities had been developed, but teachers felt that they needed more time to develop the materials before the activities were added to the book. Analysis of the data related to Objective #3 showed that the Objective was met.

Parents attended ESL classes, family math classes, and other educational opportunities offered by the District. Some of these opportunities, like other processes in the programs associated with the grant, were supplementally funded by Chapter One monies and other district funds. Over 200 parents attended various sessions of the family math classes. There were 15 parents who were trained to run the family math classes. This group of parents also made presentations to their

School Improvement Plan committees at their schools, planned workshops for the 1995-96 school year, and developed other materials for parents. Twenty parents who were involved in the workshops were interviewed. All reported that they were using the materials with their children. Eighty percent of this group also said that the materials were helping them improve their own literacy in math and science. In all, Objective #4 was met.

Classroom observations were conducted by the evaluator and by the Director. Additionally, materials developed by the teaching staff, video tapes of teaching, the teacher surveys, and an interview with the director were used to determine that staff were demonstrating successful implementation of the collaborative models (Objective #5). All of the collaborative models were used. Thirteen pairs of teachers reported using the Partners Through Team Teaching Model. Nine reported using the Partners Through Instructional Support Model. Eight reported using the Partners Through Participation Model. The Director and the teachers also indicated that although some teachers started with one model, they found themselves using another model as time went by, and they further developed their collaborative relationships. The results support that Objective #5 was met.

A random survey of twenty parents involved in the ESL parent training found that Objective #6 was met in that parents reported developing parent support groups, facilitating work at their school by serving on various committees and councils, and by volunteering in the schools, often in their child's classroom. The teacher surveys and the Director's interview support some parents are volunteering in the classrooms, although teachers report that this number is limited as many of the parents do work during the day. This was further evidenced as the various parent trainers found it necessary to provide workshops early in the morning or at night to avoid conflict with parent work hours. In all, it was determined that Objective #6 had been met.

The results related to the above objectives miss presenting some of the rich qualitative data that further supports the success of the program in year one. Some of the information obtained is important to the overall grant, and is reported below.

The teachers overwhelmingly said that they found the Director to be a good resource for them. The Director was reported to be available to answer questions, provide resources, and help organize the project. They reported that they learned more about TIMS, developing integrated units, working collaboratively, and obtaining materials and resources. The teachers did note that they found the workshops and demonstrations helpful when the Director was providing them with information and opportunities. However, there were times that the workshops did not go as the teachers expected them to, as speakers did not cover materials, and sometimes did not show up when they were expected. The Director also indicated some problems with the workshop formats that were used in year one, and noted that revisions will be made in the planning and development process of these workshops for year two.

The grant was initially designed to have ESL teachers collaborate with bilingual teachers in the bilingual classrooms. There are few certified ESL teachers in the district, and many of those that had initially agreed to be part of the grant if it was funded, either left the district, or later changed their minds about taking on the extra work associated with the grant. As a result, there were many more bilingual teachers wanting collaborators than there were collaborators available. The Director dealt with this by substituting ESL teachers with certified Chapter One teachers. The Chapter One teachers served as collaborators with some of the bilingual teachers. In other cases, the Chapter One teacher and the ESL teacher both served to collaborate with the bilingual teacher. The teacher surveys and the observations indicated that this collaboration worked well, and the

bilingual teachers reported learning many new techniques as a result of the collaborations, and instituting many new strategies in the classroom.

One of the things that the teachers and the Director indicated was problematic for the implementation of the grant this year was that the materials and resources were not available to teachers in a timely manner. Despite the publisher materials being ordered early in the year, many teachers did not receive some of the materials until near the end of the year. The publishers reported to the Director that some items were out of stock, or difficult to obtain, or were only published in limited quantities once a year because of their being published in Spanish. The Director worked with the publishers and the teachers to try to obtain alternative materials that were available, and to have materials translated as appropriate for the instructional collaborations. The Director noted that plans have already been made for changes in the materials selection process for Year Two of the grant.

One of the things that the teachers noted, and the Director agreed with, was that the teachers found themselves using more TIMS throughout the year, using more English in their classrooms, and using more cooperative learning activities. The teachers commented, and the Director agreed that the teachers needed more information on making cultural connections between the classroom instructional materials, the instructional processes, and the students' interests.The Director targeted this as one area for staff training in year two.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Conclusions and Recommendations

The results of this evaluation support that four of the six program objectives were met. The other two objectives are still in the process of being evaluated.

The ESL, bilingual, and Chapter One teachers learned to and demonstrated collaborating. They reported an increased use of varied instructional methods with their LEP students. The teachers reported taking advantage of numerous professional development opportunities provided through the grant and other district funds. The teachers developed materials and resources to share with each other and with other teachers in the district. They also developed materials and resources that were used by the parents.

The parents also attended ESL classes, family math, and other trainings. They prepared a resource book for parents to work with their children to develop language through math and science. They reported increased involvement with their children's education and with related school processes.

The project was successful in a number of areas, and should be continued with some modifications. The recommendations of the evaluator are based on the assumption that the District will be applying for future funding for the program to continue. The recommendations are:

Recommendation #1: *Teachers need to help students keep good performance-assessment records, and portfolios that are reflective not only of the current skills the student has learned, but also the skills which preceded the mastery. The teachers need to be responsible for collecting data related to their students' achievements in the English proficiency and the math science areas; and for forwarding this data to the evaluator and other appropriate places.*

The District does not have a system for maintaining student information in a central location. Records and other information is kept at the local school. The test data is kept at the local school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Unless the teacher assumes responsibility for developing and keeping data that is relevant to supporting student achievement, the evaluator will have to go from school to school to try to obtain this information. That is haphazard and does allow for more errors. The district needs to continue to develop its database capabilities and provide means for coordinators and evaluators to have access to the data.

Recommendation #2: *Future programs need to continue to find staff who are willing to be part of the program and who are willing to put the time and effort into developing materials collaboratively.*

The teachers involved in year one reported that they were willing to be part of the program. They reported that they enjoyed the monthly meetings, working with others, and feeling that they had somewhere to turn with their questions. The materials that they developed took a great deal of time and effort, and an unwilling staff member would quickly find him/herself unable to keep up with the needs of the program for developing materials for the students. The addition of the Chapter One teachers worked well this year, and they were integral to the program's success. The teachers that are recruited for the program need to be aware of the time commitment they are making. The ongoing teachers need to be provided ways to feel that their participation is valued.

Recommendation #3: *The training aspect of the program needs to continue, but with some minor modifications to add to accountability and the grant evaluation process.*

One of the areas of concern for anyone who is training is to ask what is cognitively learned, and what is behaviorally learned. That is, why do we do what we do? The training that is provided for the staff was viewed by the staff as good. However, there were some weaknesses noted. There are several options, and opportunities for training provided both through the grant and through the district. The only glitch is that all of the training is self-reported, and it has yet to be determined if teachers actually changed instructional strategies based on inservicing on collaboration, or as a result of some other processes, such as the clinical observation with feedback which was

conducted by the Director. The evaluator recommends that the program try to build some further accountability by asking teachers to complete a brief report immediately following a training session, and then a month later. This latter report would have teachers indicate if and how they implemented the training, and have them provide a sample of the work they developed related to the training. This information could also be kept in a journal.

Recommendation #4: *The high level of parent involvement needs to continue.*

Without parent involvement, the schools would not be able to function. For this particular grant, the parents who were involved attended family math workshops, may have run these workshops, worked as paid math/science facilitators, or were involved in parent support groups and attended classes.This involvement in their own learning and helping others learn is bound to have an effect on the schools.

One of the goals of the district is to develop parent effective participation (PEP). The unusually high level of bilingual parents and of low income parents puts many (60-80%) of the district's students at-risk for school problems. One of the ways to potentially minimize this risk is to have the students' parents involved in the school processes, aware of what is happening in school, and learning new skills and ways to engage with their children in the learning process. The evaluator recommends that the parent training be expanded to include family science, and family literacy classes; and parents be trained to teach these classes.

Recommendation #5: *The district needs to continue to find alternative ways to develop support mechanisms for its teachers.*

The district needs to work with the Program Director to ascertain the needs for various kinds of inservice training and other support mechanisms, and to find ways to honor the work of the teachers. The collaboration is a good start because of the number of different opportunities

offered to the teachers. Another mechanism to provide support could be to provide more aides in the classroom. Aide work could be done by parents, or by pre-service teachers. The evaluator is not advocating one way as better than the other, rather that the district do what it can to build various avenues of support for teachers. Other avenues to develop support mechanisms for teachers might include recognition ceremonies, providing books and other items to teachers, providing free supportive counseling to avoid burn-out, etc.

In conclusion, year one of the SAPG was a success, and should be continued and expanded in year two, continuing with the year one teachers and adding new teachers. The District should continue to find ways to build bridges between groups involved with the many aspects of the schooling process. The District should be commended for its innovative work in this area.